

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/726,238		Applicant(s) FEIWEIER, THORSTEN	
	Examiner Tiffany A. Fetzner		Art Unit 2859	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** After-final before NOA

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Steven H. Noll Reg. No. 28,982. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 January 2006 **Time:** 10:30 am

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
Claims 1, 2, 18, and 19

Prior art documents discussed:
Mueller et al., US Patent application publication 2003/0078491 A1 published April 24th 2003, filed September 27th 2002.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because there were still some unresolved antecedence issues, and an updated review of the prior art with respect to applicant's after-final amendment raised the issue, of potential new art becoming applicable based on applicant's amendments. The attorney indicated he was familiar with the Mueller et al., reference because it was one his firm was responsible for. He also explained that while the Mueller et al., reference did determine the phase of an emitted RF signal, with a directional coupler, which in turn was used to determine the strength of the RF emitting field; that this step was separate from, and in addition to, the magnetic resonance imaging and MR signal detection from an examined subject that was ongoing in the reference. The Mueller et al., reference does not apply the applicant's novel feature of determining the strength of the emitted RF field by using the phase of the actually received / detected MR signal from the examination subject. (i.e. in applicant's invention the separate directional coupler component is not needed.) Applicant's novelty is that the phase of the detected MR signal, which is emitted from a patient, in response to a magnetic field strength RF pulse, emitted by an RF antenna, and applied to examination subject, is utilized to determine the previously unknown magnetic field strength RF pulse that was actually applied by the RF antenna to the examination subject.